

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ari Hakim, individually and on behalf of  
all those similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

LG-Philips LCD Co. Ltd., LG Philips LCD  
America, Inc.; Samsung Electronics Co.  
Ltd.; Sharp Corporation; Sharp Electronics  
Corporation; Toshiba Corporation Toshiba  
Matsushita Display Technology Co., Ltd.;  
Hitachi Ltd.; Hitachi Displays, Ltd.;  
Hitachi America Ltd.; Hitachi Electronic  
Devices (USA), Inc.; Sanyo Epson Imaging  
Devices Corporation; NEC Corporation;  
NEC LCD Technologies, Ltd.; NEC  
Electronics America, Inc.; IDT  
International Ltd.; AU Optronics;  
International Display Technology Co.,  
Ltd.; International Display Technology  
USA Inc.; AU Optronics Corporation  
America; Chi Mei Optoelectronics; Chi  
Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc.; Chunghwa  
Picture Tubes Ltd.; Hannstar Display  
Corporation,

Defendants.

Case No. C-06-7699 MJJ

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME**

Honorable Martin J. Jenkins

**STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

WHEREAS plaintiff filed a complaint in the above-captioned case on or about December 12, 2006;

WHEREAS plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid Crystal Display ("LCD") products;

WHEREAS more than fifteen complaints have been filed to date in federal district courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bringing class actions on behalf of indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products (collectively, "the LCD Cases");

WHEREAS there is a motion pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases to the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;

WHEREAS plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended Complaints in the LCD Cases;

WHEREAS plaintiff and Hitachi America, Ltd. ("HAL") and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. ("HED-US") have agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

WHEREAS plaintiff agrees that the deadline for HAL and HED-US to respond to the Complaint shall be extended until the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after plaintiff provided written notice to HAL and HED-US that plaintiff does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case;

WHEREAS plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of their intention to join this extension;

WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by HAL and HED-US or any defendant of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject

1 matter jurisdiction, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, or improper  
2 venue.

3 PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANTS HAL AND HED-US, BY AND THROUGH THEIR  
4 RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

5 1. The deadline for the HAL and HED-US to respond to the Complaint shall be  
6 extended until the earlier of the following two dates (1) forty-five days after the filing of a  
7 Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after the plaintiff  
8 provides written notice that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint,  
9 provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the  
10 MDL transferee court in this case.

11 2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiff or  
12 further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of their  
13 intention to join this extension.

14 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

15 Dated: January 5, 2007

16 Signature: [Signature]

17 Michael P. Lehmann  
18 Thomas P. Dove  
19 Christopher L. Lebsock  
20 Jon T. King  
21 Furth Lehmann & Grant LLP  
22 225 Bush Street, 15th Floor  
23 San Francisco, CA 94104-4249

24 Brian Barry  
25 Law Office of Brian Barry  
26 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 307  
27 Los Angeles, CA 90067

28 Counsel for Plaintiff Ari Hakim

SO ORDERED:

[Signature]

Dated: January 5, 2007

Signature: [Signature]

Kent M. Roger  
William J. Taylor  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1126

Counsel for Defendants  
Hitachi America, Ltd. and Hitachi Electronic  
Devices (USA), Inc.